

**Utah Special Education Advisory Panel**  
**Minutes**  
**October 9, 2003**

**Present:** Teri Beck, Jacquelyn Chappell, Karen Hahne, Sue Hirase, Susan Johnston, Dan Leatham, Wreatha Liljenquist, Ami Neff, Stephanie Rich, Colleen Riley, Linda Smith, Corrie Watkins, Jill Weight, Karl Wilson, Rebecca Donovan

**Additional Representatives to Self-Assessment Steering Committee:** Patrice Isabella, Matt Lohmeyer, Kate McConaughy, Dwight Moore, Fraser Nelson, Kathy Shaw, Deb Wynkoop

**Guests:** Donna Gleaves, John Copenhaver, Susan Loving, Cal Newbold

**Welcome and Introductions:** Jill Weight thanked everyone for attending. Jill then asked that everyone introduce themselves to the group present.

**Approval of Minutes:** A suggestion was made that the minutes list guests separately.

**Motion:** Colleen Riley – Move the minutes be approved with the suggested change for future minutes.

**Second:** Sue Hirase

Motion passed.

**State Special Education Self-Assessment Training and Organization:** Karl Wilson explained that the time has again come for Utah to be monitored by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in Washington, DC. A very important part of this monitoring process is the self-assessment. USEAP is to serve as the steering committee for the self-assessment and will be joined by seven additional members to round out the representation of interested groups.

John Copenhaver explained the monitoring process and USEAP's role in the process. The following information is part of the presentation. A handout of the slides from John's presentation will be sent to panel members.

Elements of a Focused Monitoring System

- Limited number of priorities
- Limited number of indicators within each priority area
- OSEP publishes an annual ranking of states based on priority areas and indicators.
- Data-based information on the priority indicators is used to allocate OSEP's resources in direction of most need.
- Standard, uniform benchmarks are used for inquiry when making monitoring decisions.
- Clear, predictable triggers for interventions.
- OSEP provides supports, including building of infrastructure in poorly functioning states and, as needed imposes sanctions on states in order to achieve corrective actions/improvement within a specific time frame.
- OSEP monitoring includes attention to vulnerable populations, regardless of any other monitoring decisions made.

Verification Level 1  
Desk Audit from OSEP

Verification Level 2  
Onsite Visit

Verification Level 3  
Onsite visit to actual programs (if there are a lot of red flags in Levels 1 and 2)

All states submit a performance report annually to OSEP for the purpose of updating the state's self-assessment and improvement planning, included in the report is the impact of the state's improvement activities on performance and compliance.

Self-assessment for Part B must address the following cluster areas

- I General Supervision
- II Early Childhood Transition
- III Parent Involvement
- IV Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
- V Secondary Transition

The Advisory Panel/Steering Committee Roles:

- State Special Education Advisory Panel
  - All panel members review and provide advice regarding the self-assessment.
- State Steering Committee
  - Sub-group or task force that has a greater involvement in the self-assessment
- Core Steering Committee
  - SEA staff and other relevant individuals that analyze the data and write the draft self-assessment.

Colleen Riley asked how often the State Office would like the sub-committees to meet. Karl responded that the expectation was that the sub-committees would meet monthly.

The steering committee then broke into sub-committee groups for further discussion.

After the breakout session, John Copenhaver told the group that it would be important that they establish definable, measurable indicators. For example:

General Supervision

- All complaints will be acted upon within the required timeframe.

John also indicated that it would be important to keep the self-assessment short, to the point and user friendly.

-----End of Self-Assessment Steering Committee portion of the USEAP meeting-----

**National Monitoring Conference Report** – Jill Weight reported that she felt that she had gotten a lot out of the conference and that it was very interesting to interact with members of advisory panels from other states. Jill has found one website that she learned about to be very interesting

and helpful and has even found solutions for some things in her classroom. The website is TACOMMUNITIES.ORG

Linda Smith reported that her attendance had also been useful to her and it is interesting to look not just at what Utah is doing, but also what other states are doing.

**USEAP Annual Report** – In Jennie Gibson’s absence, Jill Weight distributed copies of the 2002 – 2003 Annual Report.

**Proposed USEAP Brochure** – Jill asked Jackie Chappell to report on the work on the brochure, thus far.

Suggestions from panel members present were to include an item on the Steering Committee on Self-Assessment and another on rural representation and diverse population representation.

**Reauthorization** – Karl Wilson reported that the proposed reauthorization was in the Senate and that it probably wouldn’t start moving again until Congress reconvenes in January. At this point the proposed reauthorization might mean a \$10 million increase and possibly \$20 million through Senate revisions.

**Graduation Requirements** – Karl reported that a major concern is how Performance Plus will impact students with disabilities. Currently the Performance Plus indicates, “accommodations may be made for some students”. Linda Smith reported that she had had the opportunity to speak with the School Board about the possible addition of “and/or modifications” after the work accommodations in the above phrase.

Proposed remedial classes might become a problem for students not performing at or above the level expected. Remedial classes might take away from the elective classes still available to students and there is concern that the elimination of elective classes might be a disincentive for some students staying in school.

There are many concerns and opinions on the proposed graduation requirements, but it is not too late to give your input. Mail your comments to:

Graduation Proposal  
Utah State Office of Education  
P O Box 144200  
Salt Lake City UT 84114-4200

Email your comments to:

[grad@usoe.k12.ut.us](mailto:grad@usoe.k12.ut.us)

Linda Smith pointed out that comments need to go to State Representatives and Senators as well as to the School Board.

**No Child Left Behind (NCLB)** – Karl reported that there continues to be controversy surrounding NCLB and the requirements of assessment and adequate yearly progress (AYP). Students are expected to be achieving at 100% by the year 2014 on end of level core testing. Consequently, there is much controversy about where that leaves students with disabilities and what will happen to schools that are not meeting the requirements.

Karl reported that Representative Strickland, from Ohio, is putting together a proposal to amend NCLB called “Student Fairness Testing Act”.

There is also a concern regarding the requirement for highly qualified teachers. “Do teachers teaching in a field have the licensure or credentials to be teaching in that area?”

Paraprofessionals raise another concern: Those who are currently providing service schoolwide in an instructional role must meet the requirements by 2006. Those who are newly hired must meet the requirements immediately.

Highly qualified teachers---regular education teachers training to meet the needs of students with disabilities is not covered by NCLB, but is a professional development issue.

**Steering Committee on Self-Assessment:** Stephanie Rich raised the question of whether the panel needed a motion to accept the appointments of the Steering Committee on Self-Assessment and the sub-committees.

**Motion:** Stephanie Rich – Move that the advisory panel accept the appointments of the Steering Committee on Self-Assessment and the sub-committees

**Second:** Karen Hahne.

Motion passed.

**Future Assignments** – Jill asked that the Brochure Committee continue the development of the proposed brochure.

Sue Hirase asked Karl what the State Office expected from the sub-committees by the November meeting. Karl asked that the groups meet and identify indicators.

Jill informed the panel that the Utah Agenda Committee would be meeting to finalize the document and that it was hoped that USEAP could receive the document in November. If not, then it will be available in the very near future. Jill further suggested that USEAP use the Utah Agenda as a guide.

**Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned. Next meeting: January 22, 2004.